REMARKS

I. Status Of The Application.

Claims 1-30 of the original application, and new claims 31-33, are pending. In the Third Office Action, the Examiner:

(a) Objected to the disclosure because it contained embedded hyperlinks and/or other form of browser-executable code at page 5 and page 14;

(b) Stated that changes were required for proper use of trademarks in the specification;

(c) Rejected claims 1-4, 7-19, 21-25, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Linton, U.S. 6,282,404 B1 ("Linton") in view of Corn et al., U.S. 2001/0053513 ("Corn et al."); and

(d) Rejected claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Linton/Corn et al., as applied to claims 1, 18, 21, and 29, and further in view of Papadopolous, U.S. 6,099,320 ("Papadopoulos"); and

In this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 17, 18, 22-25, and 28 to further clarify the invention claimed, as explained in further detail herein. Applicants have amended claim 20 to correct a typographical error that resulted in an improper antecedent basis. Also, Applicants have added new claims 31-33 which are supported by the specification as originally filed. Further, Applicants have amended the specification in order to comply with the Examiner's objection to the use of embedded hyperlinks and/or browser-executable code and to properly acknowledge trademarks. No new matter was introduced by way of any of these amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing amendments and following remarks incorporated herein overcome the Examiner's rejections to claims 1-30 and respectfully

request reconsideration of pending claims 1-30 in view of these amendments and remarks, and respectfully requests consideration of new claims 31-33.

II. The Examiner's Objections To The Specification Should Be Withdrawn.

In the Third Office Action, the Examiner stated that embedded hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable code must be deleted to be in compliance with MPEP §608.01, and that trademarks must be properly identified. In accordance with this requirement, the Applicants have replaced the hyperlinks and browser-executable code with the name of the company hosting the respective websites referenced by such hyperlinks and browser-executable code. Further, Applicants have properly identified the trademarks by the use of capital letters and the ® designation, because all the trademarks used are federally registered trademarks. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the replacement paragraphs for the specification be accepted and the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

III. The Amendments To Claims 1, 5, 17, 18, 20, 22-25, and 28 and New Claims 31-33 Are Supported By The Specification.

By this Response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 5, 17, 18, 22-25, and 28. Claim 20 was amended to address an antecedent basis issue discovered by Applicants, namely, changing "student means" to "student system". The amendments made to claims 1, 17, 18, 22-25, and 28 further clarify that the lesson comprises "content", and that the audio file or video file is "associated with the content" of the lesson. This is supported in the specification at page 18, lines 4-5, page 13, lines 6-7, page 13, line 20, and page 19, lines 14-21. The amendment made to claim 5 further requires that the educator provider system sends the certificate to the at least one student system. This is supported at page 21, lines 9-11 and 17-20. In addition, claims 31,

32, and 33 have been added. Claim 31 requires that the at least one lesson comprise a "plurality of presentations" each "comprising content" and that the "audio file be associated with the content of at least one of the plurality of presentations". This is supported in the specification at page 7, line 3, page 12, lines 19-20, and page 13, lines 6-7. Claims 32 and 33 require the combination of the audio file and a test mechanism for advancement by the student through the lesson. The addition of the test mechanism is supported at page 20, line 16 through page 21, line 5, and with Fig. 9. Therefore, no new matter is introduced by way of introduction of these new claims 31-33.

IV. The Rejection Of Claims 1-4, 7-19, 21-25, And 27-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Linton In View of Corn et al. Should Be Withdrawn.

In the Third Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7-19, 21-25 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton in view of Corn et al. Applicants believe they have overcome the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-19, 21-25, and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. "To establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP 2143.03 (citing *In re Royka,* 490 F.2d 981 (C.C.P.A. 1974)). Applicants respectfully submit that all the limitations of claims 1-4, 7-19, 21-25, and 27-29 are not taught or suggested by Linton and/or Corn et al., and that claims 1-4, 7-19, 21-25, and 27-29 are allowable over Linton in view of Corn et al.

A) Independent Claims 1, 17, 18, 22-25, and 28 Are Patentably Distinguishable From Linton in View of Corn et al.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably distinguishable because Linton and Corn et al., alone or in combination, do not disclose all of the elements of independent claims 1, 17, 22-24 and 28, as amended.

1. The Present Invention

Applicants' invention comprises an online education system and method that uses an audio file and/or a video file to control the "pace of the presentation of the lesson" and the "rate of advancement through each presentation of the lesson." Page 7, lines 7-9. In addition, the system and method of the present invention are used to make certain that a student "attends" "the lesson for at least a specified amount of time", i.e., "for at least the minimum time represented by the collective time required to play each of the audio [and/or video] files associated with each of the presentations of the lesson." Page 7, lines 9-12. It is, of course, important that a student actually digest the content of a lesson given in an online environment.

To accomplish these advantages, Applicants' invention, as claimed in claims 1-16, requires that "the content of at least one lesson page/screen has associated therewith at least one audio file." Page 18, lines 4-5. The system will "play the audio file(s) associated with the pages of the lesson to serve as an audio controlling mechanism." Page 13, lines 21-22. In claims 1, 17, 22-24, as amended, it is clear that the "lesson comprises content", and the audio file(s) and/or video file(s) used for the controlling mechanism are "associated with the content of the lesson". It is further required that the student user cannot advance until the audio file or video file has completed playing.

The association of the audio and/or video file(s) with the content of the lesson is supported throughout the specification. At page 18, line 15 through page 19, line 21, examples of the association of the file with the content of the lesson are given. These examples include a "reading" of text portions of that displayed on the screen, the sound of a video, separate audio, music, sound effects, or other combinations of auditory tones.

2. Linton and Corn et al.

The invention of Linton has been discussed and distinguished from Applicants' invention in prior responses, and such distinctions are incorporated herein by reference. With regard to Corn et al., Corn et al. discloses a system and method for providing educational content over a network that utilizes a timer. This timer is best understood by examining the method of operation of the system of Corn et al. As stated at page 4 [0031], lines 14-17, "The process of logging in starts an applet which in turn causes the electronic device 16 to start an internal clock (step 54). The start time is stored in an accumulator 24." "The user of the electronic device indicates they have finished reviewing the educational content contained in the retrieved web page by logging out via dialog boxes and a logout button." Page 4, [0031], lines 22-25. "The act of logging out causes the internal clock to stop". Page 4 [0031], lines 29-30.

As shown in Fig. 3 and further explained at page 4 [0031], the cumulative time that a user is at an educational unit is determined. After a student exits an educational unit, the time spent on the educational unit is compared to a minimum time parameter and a maximum time parameter to determine if time between the preset minimum and maximum was spent on the educational unit. The minimum time parameter and the maximum time parameter appear to be constants for a particular educational lesson, and each lesson may comprise several web pages or

educational units. No where does Corn et al. indicate that different minimum and maximum time parameters are established for each web page. Thus, the minimum time parameter and the maximum time parameter are the same for each web page (educational unit) displayed.

Also, as shown in Fig. 3, and further explained at page 4 [0031], a user is permitted to leave the current web page without regard to whether the minimum time parameter or maximum time parameter has been exceeded. According to Fig. 3, the step of the "User indicates Finished Study" (step 56) and the step of "User Returns to Initial Web Page with Recorded Elapsed Time" (step 58) are completed before the time elapsed in compared at sets 59 and 61. This sequence is supported at page 4 [0031].

3. Linton Together with Corn et al. Do Not Disclose All Of The Elements Of Independent Claims 1, 17, 18, 22-25, and 28.

The Examiner stated at page 4 of the Third Office Action that:

> Linton does not disclose expressly so that at least one student cannot advance in the at least one lesson until the audio file or video file has completed playing. However, Corn teaches preventing a user from rapidly clicking their way through screens by tracking elapsed time a user spends reviewing educational content. See p.4 [0031] and p.5 [0032]. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate preventing a user from rapidly clicking their way through screens by tracking elapsed time a user spends reviewing educational content *because Applicant has not disclosed that preventing a student from advancing in the at least one lesson until the audio file or video file has completed playing provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a state [sic] stated problem.* One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well tracking elapsed time a user spends reviewing educational content because both mechanisms perform the same function of verifying that users spend a required amount of time reviewing education content and subsequently are materially participating in the educational process.

(emphasis added).

First, although Corn et al. states that it tracks "elapsed time a user spends reviewing educational content", this statement is, respectfully, misleading when compared to Applicants' invention. In Corn et al., there is no relation between the actual content of a particular web page and the minimum time parameter or the maximum time parameter. The system of Corn et al. makes it easy for a user to ignore the educational content. All that is required of the user is that the user spend some time with that screen "up" before the user clicks the logoff button to be taken back to the initial screen.

Applicant's also respectfully disagree with the statement that Corn et al. "teaches preventing a user from rapidly clicking their way through screens by tracking elapsed time a user spends reviewing educational content", because Corn et al. allows a user to advance to the next screen. The only requirement is that the user spend an amount of time on the screen that falls between a preset minimum and maximum time parameter. In fact, Corn et al, requires that the student advance in the lesson by logging out of the screen so that the elapsed time can be determined and compared to the minimum time parameter and maximum time parameter. Once the elapsed time is determined to be less that the minimum time parameter, "the user is sent a message that further review is required and is returned to the educational unit web page". Page 4 [0031], lines 32-38. The method of Corn et al. is, therefore, very inefficient, for it results in the user continually bouncing between the educational unit and the home page.

Applicants respectfully also disagree with the statement that Applicants have not indicated that the audio file or video file of Applicants' invention "provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a state [sic] stated problem". The association with the audio or video file with the content of the lesson helps to ensure that the student hears or sees the content of the lesson. Receipt of the content of the lesson is the purpose of the lesson. Thus, the

association of content with controlling mechanisms provides a better, more appropriate control mechanism than any simple timer can offer. As set forth in the Abstract, lines 20-22, with "the use of the system and method of the present invention, an education authority can be assured that a student attends the online lesson for the requisite minimum time period, and that the student satisfactorily completes the lesson." Also, with the "use of the audio and/or video controlling mechanism of the present invention, the system provides a means by which the student is required to 'attend' the lesson for a specified period of time. In particular, the student must 'attend' the class for a time at least equal to the time required to play the audio file(s) and/or video file(s) associated with the lesson." Page 24, lines 3-7. Such attendance is, according to the present invention, tied to the content of the lesson. Such attendance is not required if a simple timing mechanism is used, for a student can easily avoid and never review the content of the lesson if all that is required is that a screen be posted for a minimum time period. Also, it is preferable for the controlling mechanism to reflect the amount or complexity of the particular presentation (page or screen) of the lesson – different screens will take different amounts of time for a user to receive (read, hear, or see) the content. A single minimum time parameter and a single maximum time parameter for all screens as disclosed in Corn et al. does not provide such flexibility. Further, audio and video presentations with and without textual presentations are known to be better adept in getting and keeping the student's attention than are text alone. The association of the content of the lesson with such audio and video files enhances the possibility that the student will have engaged in the lesson, i.e., attended the lesson.

Note also that Applicants' contemplated the use of a timer in connection with the present invention. At page 19, line 22 through page 20, line 2, Applicants state: "It will be appreciated that time restrictions other than those associated with the time to play the audio files may be

employed with the system and method of the present invention. For example, the student may be required to advance, seek help, or logout within a prescribed time period of time after completion of the playing of the audio file(s) associated with a page of the lesson". It is conceivable that such a time restriction could be that disclosed in Corn et al.

Claim 1, as amended, requires that "the at least one lesson comprises content", "the audio file is associated with the content of the at least one lesson", and "the presentation of the at least one lesson is controlled by an audio controlling means based on the received audio file, so that the at least one student cannot advance in the at least one lesson until the audio file has completed playing". As agreed by the Examiner in the above-quoted statement, Linton does not disclose "that at least one student cannot advance in the at least one lesson until the audio file or video file has completed playing". Likewise, Corn et al. does not teach or suggest such a prohibition against advancement. In fact, Corn et al. requires that the student advance (logout from the current screen) before the checking mechanism, i.e., the timer, is even determined or compared to the minimum time parameter and the maximum time parameter. Further, Corn et al. does not teach or suggest a controlling mechanism that is "associated with the content" of the lesson. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Linton and Corn et al., alone or in combination, and that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton in view of Corn et al. is overcome.

Claim 17, as amended, requires that the "lesson comprise content", "the at least one video file is associated with the content", and "the presentation of the at least one lesson is controlled by the video controlling means based on the received video file, so that the at least one student cannot advance in the at least one lesson until the video file has completed playing." Neither Linton nor Corn et al. teach or suggest a controlling mechanism (i.e. "the video controlling

means based on the video file" of claim 17) that is associated with the content of the lesson. Further, Linton and Corn et al. do not teach or suggest, alone or in combination, a "video controlling means based on the received video file", with "video file associated with the content" of the lesson that operates such that "student cannot advance in the at least one lesson until the video file has completed playing." Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17, as amended, is patentable, and the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton in view of Corn et al. is overcome.

Claim 18, as amended, like claims 1 and 17, requires an audio file or video file "associated with the content" of the lesson, where the audio file or video file "controls the presentation of the lesson, so that the at least one student cannot advance in the at least one lesson until the audio file or video file has completed playing." For the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 1 and 17, Applicant's respectfully submit that claim 18 is patentable, and rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton in view of Corn et al. is overcome.

Claims 22-25 and 28 are all directed toward methods. These claims, as amended, require that the lesson comprise "content", the audio file or video file be "associated with the content of the lesson", and the step of "controlling the pace of the presentation" of the lesson with the audio or video file so that student "cannot advance" in the lesson until the audio or video file has "completed playing". Because neither Linton nor Corn et al. disclose the step of controlling the pace of the presentation and prevention from advancing in the lesson with a controlling mechanism (i.e. the video or audio files of claims 22-25 and 28) that is associated with the content of the lesson, it is respectfully submitted that claims 22-25 and 28 are patentable, and the

rejection of claims 22-25 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton in view of Corn et al. is overcome.

B) Dependent Claims 2-4, 7-16, 19, 21, 27, and 29 Are Patentably Distinguishable From Linton in View of Corn et al.

Applicants respectfully submit Linton in view of Corn et al. does not anticipate the present invention because it does not disclose all of the elements of claims 2-4, 7-16, 19, 21, 27, and 29. Because claims 2-4 and 7-16 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 1, which is believed to be allowable, claims 2-4 and 7-16 are also allowable and the rejection of claims 2-4 and 7-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton in view of Corn et al. should be withdrawn. Claims 19, 21, and 27 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 18, and claim 29 depends from and includes all the limitations of claim 28. Because claims 18 and 28 are believed to be allowable, dependent claims 19, 21, 27, and 29 are also allowable, and the rejection of claims 19, 21, 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton in view of Corn et al. should be withdrawn.

V. The Examiner's Rejection Of Claims 5-6, 20, 26, And 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Linton/Corn et al. In View of Papadopoulos Should Be Withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not obvious over Linton/Corn et al. in view of Papadopoulos because neither Linton/Corn et al. nor Papadopoulos teach or suggest all of the claim limitations in claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 of the present invention. "To establish prima facie obviousness of the claimed invention, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP 2143.03 (citing *In re Royka,* 490 F.2d 981 (C.C.P.A. 1974)). Further, "[i]f an independent claim is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then

any claim depending therefrom is not obvious." MPEP 2143.03 (citing *In re Fine,* 837 F.2d 1382, 1385 (C.C.P.A. 1970)). Claims 5-6 each depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1, as amended. Further, claims 20 and 26 each depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 18, and claim 30 depends from and incorporates all of the limitations of independent claim 28.

As discussed above, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 18 and 28, as amended, in view of Linton/Corn et al. should be withdrawn because neither Linton nor Corn et al., alone or in combination teach or suggest the use of an audio file or video file for controlling the pace of the lesson when the audio file or video file is "associated with the content of the lesson", as now required. Because claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 depend from and include all the limitations of claims 1, 18, and 28, as amended, claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 are allowable and the rejection of claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton/Corn et al. in view of Papadopoulos should be withdrawn.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not obvious in view of Papadopoulos. Papadopoulos discloses a virtual training center that allows a student to access training courses from a computer based training program. Once a course is selected and the course title page is opened, the student has control of the course pace using forward and reverse buttons on the system. (Col. 8, lines 26-36). Papadopoulos further provides that a completion certificate can be provided by the system for the purposes of being presented to the student from an administrator, supervisor or other appropriate personnel. (Col. 8, lines 59-62).

Claim 5, as amended, requires that "educator provider system includes means for generating an electronic certificate for transmission over the network means **to the at least one student system**". In this manner, the student is able to "obtain official acknowledgement of

successful completion in an expeditious manner". Page 22, lines 22-23. "Such acknowledgement may be critical if the student completes the lesson at a time near the deadline imposed by the education authority or regulating authority." Page 24, lines 10-11. When the lesson is used as a continuing education, the student may need to prove to an employer that it has completed the appropriate continuing education. When the education is required by an employer but does not require that the education be subject to a separate educational authority, the student may also need to prove to an employer that it has completed the course.

The invention of Papadopoulos does not teach or suggest delivery of a certificate directly to the student. Instead, the certificate is delivered to another entity who may then deliver the certificate to the student. As discussed above, there are many instances in which immediate delivery to the student is desired and even necessary. Because claim 5 requires that " educator provider system includes means for generating an electronic certificate for transmission over the network means **to the at least one student system**", and Papadopoulos does not teach or suggest such direct delivery, but rather requires delivery to the student by a third party, it is believed that claim 5 is patentable, and the rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton/Corn et al. in view of Papadopoulos should be withdrawn. Because claim 6 depends from and includes all the limitations of claim 5, as amended, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is also patentable, and the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton/Corn et al. in view of Papadopoulos should be withdrawn.

Claim 20 depends from and includes all the limitations of claims 18 and 19. Claim 18 requires "the lesson completion record is immediately transmitted to the at least one student system upon the completion of the lesson". Claim 19 requires that the completion record comprise a "unique course identifier", and claim 20 requires "the lesson completion record

comprises an electronic certificate; and the at least one student system includes means for printing the electronic certificate ". Key to claim 20 is the ability of the at least one student system, to which the electronic certificate was "**immediately transferred**", to print the electronic certificate. In this manner, the student is able to print the certificate of completion immediately after completion of the course. As discussed above in connection with claim 5, Papadopoulos does not teach or suggest such an immediate transfer and printing at the student system. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton/Corn et al. in view of Papadopoulos should be withdrawn.

Claim 26 requires that "the student system on which the lesson was completed further comprises means for printing" and the method requires the additional step of "printing the certificate of completion with the printing means". As discussed above in association with claims 5 and 20, Papadopoulos does not teach or suggest a method involving printing of the completion certificate at the student system, but instead teaches delivery of the certificate to a third party for subsequent delivery to the student. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 26 is allowable, and the rejection of claim 26 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Linton/Corn et al. in view of Papadopoulos should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, as previously stated, because claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 depend from and include all the limitations of claims 1, 18, and 28, which are believed to be allowable, claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 are also allowable. Also, because claims 5-6 require that the system include a means for transmitting the electronic certificate to the student system which is not taught or suggested by Papadopoulos, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Linton/Corn et al. nor Papadopoulos, alone or in combination, teach all the claim limitations of claims 5-6. Because claim 20 requires that the system have the ability to immediately transfer the certificate to the

student system and also have the ability to print the certificate at the student system, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Linton/Corn et al. nor Papadopoulos, alone or in combination, teach all the limitations of claim 20. As to claim 26, claim 26 requires the step of printing the certificate with the student system which is not taught or suggested by Linton/Corn et al. or Papadopoulos, alone or in combination.

Based on the fact that the above limitations of claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 are not taught by Linton/Corn et al. nor Papadopoulos, and because claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 are dependent upon independent claims that are not taught by Linton/Corn et al. nor Papadopoulos, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 5-6, 20, 26, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Linton/Corn et al. in view of Papadopoulos should be withdrawn.

VI. New Claims 31, 32, and 33 Should Be Allowed.

Applicants submit herewith new independent claims 31, 32, and 33. Respectfully, claims 31, 32, and 33 are allowable over the art cited by the Examiner. Specifically, claim 31 specifies that the system comprise a plurality of presentations, with "each of the plurality of presentations comprising content". The system of claim 31 further requires an "audio file or video file ... associated with the content of the at least one the plurality of presentations", with the "presentation of the at least one lesson ... controlled by a controlling means based on the received audio file or video file". Because claim 31 includes the same requirements for association of the audio or video file with the content of the lesson, and control of the pace and advancement of the lesson as required in claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 is allowable.

With regard to claim 32, the lesson is required to comprise an audio file or video file associated with the content of the lesson, and an interactive test relating to the content of the lesson. The pace and advancement of the system of claim 32 is controlled by a controlling means associated with the audio file or video file together with the determination that the student has comprehended the content via the interactive test. The combination of the audio or video control means together with the interactive test gives further assurance that the student has "attended" the lesson and comprehended the lesson so as to give or deny the student credit, as appropriate. Because claim 32 requires a controlling means for control of the pace and advancement of the lesson based on an audio file or video file, it is believed that claim 32 is allowable.

Claim 33 is a method claim requiring that the system include a first and second presentation, with the first presentation having an audio file associated with the content of the first presentation. The second presentation comprises an interactive test. The method of claim 33 requires that the pace of the first presentation of the lesson be controlled with the received audio file or video file "so that the at least one student cannot advance [to the second presentation] until the audio file or video file has completed playing." The interactive test of the second presentation further controls the pace of the lesson by prohibiting the student from proceeding until it is determined that the student has comprehended the lesson. Thus, claim 33 requires an audio or video controlling means, believed to be patentable over the references examined, together with a test mechanism to control the pace and advancement of the lesson.

Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of these new claims 31, 32, and 33.

VII. Applicants Will Correct the Figures Upon Receiving A Notice of Allowance.

Applicants received and reviewed the Draftsperson's objections to Figures 1-12 that accompanied the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that they will correct the informal drawings upon receiving a Notice of Allowance.

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Applicants have made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested. If any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. Applicants include a check in the amount of $156.00 as payment for the additional three (3) claims beyond the thirty (30) in the original application, and for the additional three (3) independent claims in addition to the eight (8) independent claims in the original application. In the event Applicants have inadvertently overlooked the need for payment of an additional fee, Applicants conditionally petition therefor, and authorize any deficiency or overpayment to be charged to deposit account 09-0007.

Respectfully submitted,

ICE MILLER

Doreen J. Gridley, Reg. No. 35,167
Ice Miller
One American Square, Box 82001
Indianapolis, IN 46282-0002
Telephone: (317) 236-2472
Facsimile: (317) 592-4665

Date: 12/10/03

Enclosures: Return Postcard
Check in the Amount of $156.00

cc: Mr. Michael J. Betz